

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTO	R ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/632,178 07/31/2003	Katsuhisa Kataoka	JP920020135US1	9826		
25259 7590 0 IBM CORPORATION	EXAM	EXAMINER			
3039 CORNWALLIS RD.	PRICE, N	PRICE, NATHAN E			
DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12 REASEARCH TRIANGLE PA	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
REAGEARCH TRAINIGES TA	2194	2194			
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPO	NSE NOTIFICATION DATE	NOTIFICATION DATE DELIVERY MODE			
3 MONTHS	03/23/2007	ELECT	ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 03/23/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

RSWIPLAW@us.ibm.com

			Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary			10/632,178	КАТАОКА, КАТ	KATAOKA, KATSUHISA		
			Examiner	Art Unit			
			Nathan Price	2194			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commu or Reply	nication appe	ars on the cover sheet	with the correspondence a	ddress		
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M nsions of time may be available under the provision. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this come period for reply is specified above, the maximum s re to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DA's of 37 CFR 1.136 munication. tatutory period will y will, by statute, c	(a). In no event, however, may apply and will expire SIX (6) MC ause the application to become	IICATION. a reply be timely filed DNTHS from the mailing date of this ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on 31 July	/ 2003 and 04 August :	2006.			
•			iction is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the	application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.						
-	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or	election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the	ne Examiner.					
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are	∷ a)∐ accep	oted or b) Objected to	o by the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any object	ection to the dr	awing(s) be held in abey	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
•	☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	•	•				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
	application from the Internation	•					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachmen	• •						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (I	DTO 049\		V Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date			
	e of Dransperson's Patent Drawing Review (in mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		5) D Notice o	f Informal Patent Application			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/4/2006</u> . 6) Other:							

Art Unit: 2194

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 18 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed 04 August 2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Objections

 \sim 3. Claims 3 – 6 and 10 – 18 are objected to because of the following informalities:

There is insufficient antecedent basis for numerous elements. For example, there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the processing" in lines 4 - 5 of claim 3 and "the same file name" in claims 4, 10 and 16. Claims 4 - 6, 11, 12, 17 and 18 inherit the deficiencies of claim(s) on which they are dependent.

Claims 13 – 18 recite a program allowing a computer to execute steps. It is not clear that the program causes the execution rather than merely not interfering with or preventing the execution.

Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2194

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 3 - 6, 9 - 12 and 15 - 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claims 3, 9 and 15, it is not clear if "or" near the end of the claims indicates that only one of the two functionalities is required to be present or if both functionalities are included, but only one is performed based on the condition (information being present in the cache). If only one of the two functionalities is required to be present, then no action is performed if the condition results in not performing the one present function.

Claims 12 and 18 recite the limitation "the first and second processing steps" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 2194

5. Claims 7 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 7 – 18 do not appear to produce a useful, concrete and tangible result. When the condition does not result in an action being performed, the claims do not appear to produce a useful, concrete and tangible result. See also rejection of claims 9 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Also, it appears that some actions (such as "to store" in the 4th step in claim 8) are not recited as being performed so as to produce a useful, concrete and tangible result.

Claims 13 – 18 appear to recite elements that can be implemented in software alone and are therefore rejected as software, per se. See MPEP 2106.01. It appears that the claims do not include hardware necessary to realize the functionality of the software. The claims are therefore rejected as being directed toward non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 5

7. As to claim 1, Ayyagari teaches an interface apparatus for a structured document, for performing processing of lexical analysis and processing of notifying an application program of a processing requester of information relating to the structured document in order with respect to the structured document requested to be processed from the application program (abstract), the apparatus comprising:

store means for associating the information notified to the application program as with the structured document to store the information into a cache (col. 4 lines 50 - 67); and

first notification means for notifying the application program as the processing requester of the information relating to the structured document in order based on the information of the cache, when there is the information in the cache with respect to the structured document as a processing object (col. 4 lines 50 - 67).

Ayyagari teaches processing XML documents (col. 4 lines 50 - 67), but fails to specifically teach series of events and event set information. However, Patel teaches the series of events and event set information associated with processing XML documents (\P 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

Application/Control Number: 10/632,178

Art Unit: 2194

time Applicant's invention was made to combine these teachings because Ayyagari teaches processing XML documents and Patel teaches what is involved in processing XML documents.

8. As to claim 2, combination of Ayyagari and Patel teaches:

second notification means for reading the structured document whose event set information is not in the cache to perform the processing of the lexical analysis and the processing of notifying the application program as the processing requester of the series of events relating to the structured document in order (Ayyagari: col. 4 lines 50 - 67; Patel: \P 35),

wherein the store means associates the series of events notified to the application program by the second notification means as the event set information with the structured document to store the information into the cache (Ayyagari: col. 4 lines 50 – 67; Patel: ¶ 35).

9. As to claim 3, combination of Ayyagari and Patel teaches an interface apparatus for a structured document, comprising:

first processing means for reading the structured document as a processing request object to perform the processing of the lexical analysis, the processing of notifying the application program as the processing requester of the series of events relating to the structured document in order, and the processing of associating the notified series of events as the event set

Art Unit: 2194

information with the structured document to store the information into the cache (Ayyagari: col. 4 lines 50 – 67; Patel: ¶ 35);

second processing means for reading the event set information of the cache with respect to the structured document as the processing request object to notify the application program as the processing requester of the series of events relating to the event set information in order (Ayyagari: col. 4 lines 50 – 67; Patel: ¶ 35); and

control means for checking whether or not the event set information of the structured document as the processing object is in the cache to delegate the processing concerning the structured document as the processing object to the first processing means, when there is not the event set information in the cache, or to delegate the processing concerning the structured document as the processing object to the second processing means, when there is the event set information in the cache (Ayyagari: col. 4 lines 50 – 67; Patel: ¶ 35).

See the rejection of claim 1 for further explanation.

- 10. As to claims 7 9 and 13 15, see the rejection of claims 1 3.
- 11. Claims 4 6, 10 12 and 16 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayyagari in view of Patel as applied to claims 3, 9 and 15 above, and further in view of Coulouris (see PTO-892).

Application/Control Number: 10/632,178

Art Unit: 2194

12. As to claim 4, combination of Ayyagari and Patel teaches the control means judges presence/absence of the event set information of the structured document as the processing object in the cache, and judges that there is not the event set information in the cache with respect to the structured document as the processing object, when the event set information relating to a structured document having the same file name as that of the structured document as the processing object exists in the cache (Ayyagari: col. 4 lines 1 - 27, 50 - 67; Patel: ¶ 35).

Page 8

- 13. Ayyagari fails to specifically teach the condition of when the event set information relates to a structured document before update of the existing structured document. However, Coulouris teaches validating cached data (page 231 "Client caching"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to combine these teachings because Ayyagari teaches using caches and Coulouris teaches details about caching.
- 14. As to claim 5, Ayyagari teaches the control means is a parser notified from the application program of the processing requester of the structured document of the processing request object by URL (col. 4 lines 50 67), making it obvious to use a URI.
- 15. As to claim 6, Ayyagari teaches the first and second processing means are mounted in corresponding parsers, whereas the control means is mounted in the

Art Unit: 2194

application program as the processing requester (col. 4 lines 50 – 67; col. 5 line 59 – col. 6 line 28).

16. As to claims 10 - 12 and 16 - 18, see the rejection of claim 4 - 6.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record on the P.T.O. 892 that has not been relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Careful consideration of the cited art is required prior to responding to this Office Action, see 37 C.F.R. 1.111(c).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Price whose telephone number is (571) 272-4196. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am - 3:00pm, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2194

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NP

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAM